1878
(L.R.)

File No 17.
Serial No. 1-3

Sub: Declaration of Thammasetti halli of the Doddaballapur Taluk as a Jodi Inam village

95

G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1878
~~191—~~
(L. R.)

File No. VI

Serial Nos. 1—3.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—3

Major ~~Part~~ B for February 1879.

SUBJECT.

Declaration of Thammasetti halli of the Doddaballapur Taluk, as a Jodi Inam village.

Indexed.
GSubbarao

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—13-12-13

No. 342.

3

Memo

In the 13th Column of the Register of the village of ~~Bada~~ Vamsetthalle ~~Vadavadada~~ in the ~~Hosdroke~~ Taluk, the Inamdar stated that the Sanad from Deva Venkat Raj Ars alluded to the Maharajah's order, as having granted the village on Jodi; that the word Kayem or permanent is not used in it, in the Hongdar Sanad; that the use of the word "Jodi" would merely mean "light Assessment" and the documents produced do not convey the meaning of Kayem or permanent Assessment; that it might be presumed that the mere Entry of the village in the Kayamgutta Accts of 1835 from the Ch. Comrs Office is not to be accepted for the validity of the tenure

, and unless they
can Rule of 50 years en-
-joyment, Conveying a valid
title be also applied to the
Kayamgutta villages. This
village is liable to Resumption,
unless it be treated as a Jodi
village; that Money be paid
that the Kabaraja receive
gain Sannads for ordinary
Kandayam lands in villages,
and every Consideration
is due to the fact that
such lands were granted
on a Shaya or progressive
Assessment and that they
have been Reclaimed from
Jungle and waste and been
Populated with villages;
but that the absence of
the word Kayam, which is
so distinctly used in all
regular Kayemgutta Sannads
and Nurjas would tend to
shew that the Rajah
had not intended to
Convey away the right
of;

3

of revising the assessment and thereunto in any Jodi Inamdi Accounts would show that the Inamdi was not intended to be Inam; that a Jaked from the Amildar to the Thekdar, Chanbog and Potel specifies the Maharajahs order of 1827/28 as having granted the village in Kayamgutta.

No 41 d/19th Sept 1878

The Inam Supt requests the Inam Comr to favour him with the Ch. Comrs decision on the point.

No 1067 d/25th Sept 1878

2. The Inam Comr forwards the above for the Ch. Comrs orders, and states that villages Jakeik alleged to be Kayamgutta have no visible claim to be treated as Inam villages and have the ✗ 50 year rule applied. If not Kayamgutta they are Jodi villages subject to resumption of assessment.

If

If the 50 years rule was applied to villages ~~failing~~ to make good their claim to be Kayemgutta, the Swamy rule might be equally claimed to be applied to purely Govt land, never claimed as otherwise, which could show that the Assessment had for any reason been unchanged for 50 years.

3. In the accounts of Kara (1831) and subsequent years the village is entered as Kayemgutta. No copies of Sannads of Maha Rajahs are forthcoming. But in the Nirik of Devan Venkatrayalu of 1828 the word "Jodi" is used. If the entry in the accounts is not to be admitted as proof of the Kayemgutta tenure, I think the words will have to be treated specially

5

under the Immediate

7

14/10/78

× date not given

In Augustus Heriot's Journal[28] × and in Cumberland Lakes of 1827-28 he alludes to Kabangabé's orders in this case - The former Gesta has only as regards the Village a doubtful Right reserving/and in like gesta he orders also as nothing a Kayen gesta grant. / In Kabangabé Samuel dolfi's last Journal, and in unpublished Log Book he terms the Nyanié part actually. From 1831 the Village has been in the Talub Acct. as Kayen gesta Village, and the encumstance may account for the being excluded from the Sarikanti Acct. subsequent to 1828.

See Col. 7 of this Register

It seems probable that Augustus Heriot's Journal formed the Materials under the Imm

6

to grant – and his
– succession from the
grant has been kept
out of sight in the
of the Order on which it
is alleged to be based, has
been pressed I think for
treating the Village as
a Jodi Inam – in preference
to such Instrument as the
Inam Commissioner may deem
suitable –
I do not
think it would be expedient
~~to do so~~ to resume the
Village for as proposed
by Col Anderson
15/6

The term Jodi refers to
an Inam tenure which
is quite distinct in kind
from Kayem gootta.
The Neroop of D Enum
Venkata Urs, unsupported
by the production of the
Sunnud of the Maharaja
therein referred to, and
at variance with the terms
of the entry in the public
accounts is utterly value
less.

The title entirely rests
on the entry in the public
account of 1835 as Kayem
gootta, and the actual
enjoyment of the village
as such ever since.

The enjoyment ca
under the circumstances, be re
as usurpations, bu
not supported by suf
authority, and must
treated as an Inam
under similar circ
be. The enjoyment
the Kayem gootta te
must be reckoned as
from 1835, previous
not representing this
it is therefore not
years duration.

The village mu
treated on the prin
that would be appl
a Jodi Inam of
50 years enjoyment
supported by a va
grant.

30/

Drafted

7

No 7925/181 dy 21st Dec 1/79

No 207 dy 24th July 1879

4th The above order was Communicated to the Survey and Enam Commr

5. He now states that in this case it appears to him that the order of the Maha-Rajah granting the village of Vandette halle as Hayam-gutta is not forthcoming, but it is quoted in a Hongdatté Extract of 1828, which quotes the order as granting the village on Jodi; that the Extract of the Hongdatté as by Para 2 of Chief Commrs order No 7925/1811 above quoted declared to be valueless to Confer the village as Hayamgutta, but notwithstanding it appears to be considered sufficient to justify the grant of the village as Jodi a superior tenure to Hayamgutta, in that it makes a permanent Settlement of the Revenue a point specially interdicted in Relation

Relation to villages declared to be Hayangatta by notification of Government of India No 52 R of 24th May 1877 furnished with Chief Commrs No. 3052/77 dated 26th June 1877; that this case may form a precedent, he now refers it to the Chief Commr for orders, as the superiority of the Jodi tenure claimed by the Hayangatta tenure denied may have escaped notice; but that this point was again referred to in Chief Commrs No 79 of the 23rd Ultimo.

Please see para 4 of this office letter to India No ~~7925~~ 8060 of 30th Dec 78. R 121 Perhaps it will be well to defer the settlement of the case under ref. till we hear from India in reply to the above letter. Many Survey Cases be suspended accordingly?

R Thumboo
12/3/79

9

1878

√02811

69

From

The Survey and Drain Comr
of Mysore
Poona

To

L. R.
17-76

Dated 25th September

Despatched

Received 28 11

Enclosures No.

General No. 1067.

No.

Forwards for orders letter from Superintendent of Inam regarding [redacted] settihalli Kayengutta Village in Doddaballapur Taluk

28-9-78

No. 41

Bangalore 19th Septr 1878.

From

Inam Superintendent in Mysore.

To

Inam Commissioner in Mysore.

Despatched 20th September 1878.

Received 1878.

Enclosures. one

REFERENCE.

~~*Your No.*~~ ~~*dated*~~ ~~187~~ .

Has the honor to forward a copy of the Regr of the Rayenguttu village of Thamsettihalli of the Goodiallapur Taluk, and to request that he may be favored with the decision of the Ch. Commr on the ~~the~~ point involved therein.

Recd 25 Sept 1878

Inam Commr's Office

11

No. 41

Bangalore, 19th September 1878.

From

13

Inam Superintendent in Mysore.

To

Inam Commissioner in Mysore.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 3,
of the 14th Instant, soliciting the orders of the
Chief Commissioner on the Regr of the vil
lage of Basabattanhalli of the Hosköté
Taluk, I have the honor to forward a copy
of the Regr of the Kayemgutta village of Tha
-settihalli of the Doddaballapur Taluk,
and to request that I may be favored
with the decision of the Chief Commr
on the point mooted in para 3 of Col: 13
of the Register.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt

Supt of Inams Settlt

No 1067 of 1878 12

14

Survey Commissioner's Office

Poona 25th September 1878.

Forwarded for the order
of the Ac. Coll. Villages Selsey
alleged to be Kayampodee have
no visible claim to be treated
as Inam villages and have the
50 years rule applied. If not
Kayampotta they are Govt villages
subject to revision & assessment
if the 50 years rule was applied
to villages finally to make good
their claim to be Kayampotta
but have only slight to specify
claimed to be applied to pure
Govt land, waste claimed as their
own, which could have that the
assessment had for any reason been
unchanged for 50 years

Subj to the Coll.

[illegible]
Ass Coll.

13 Register of the Rayeen

Number of Cases	General Cases to which Rayeen quitta will Lapse Collector's.	Rent of the village.	Description of Claim & for Service &c. &c. & the State of whether the service is continued & by which of the Chiefs they are efficiently kept up.	Amount of Rayeen = quitta Payable to Government.	Remissions granted during the current year.
1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Personal	Kadim Bérij P-7-0 16-1-0 = Rs-a-p 46-13-4	For Personal benefit.	P-7-0 16-1-0 = Rs-a-p 46-13-4	B. B. The Maharajah Sarvajith 1827-28. Kadim Bérij P-7-0 16-1-0.

Sira Taluk, Bangalore District

Assistant's Opinion and Recommendation.

13.

1. The Taluk Record Keeper States that the notice has been sent to the Amil of Mysore to be served on Dod Venkatasawmi, residing at Mysore at present.

Adjourned Sine die. —

13th August 1878 (Signed) Robt Cole —

2. Re 2 in col: 10 has this day appeared & produced the documents quoted in Col: 7. He states that he does not know what has become of the Krishna Rajah's Sannad of 1827-28, which is quoted in the acct of 1835 of Kayemgutta villages, received from the Chief Commrs Office. The Extract quoted in Col: 7, from the Dewan Venkat Raj Urs alluded to the Maharajah's order, as having granted the village on Jodi. The word Kayem, or permanent is not used in it, or in the Foujdar's Extract, Re 3 in col: 7. The use of the word "Jodi" would merely mean "Light Assessment", and the documents produced do not convey the meaning of Kayem or permanent Assessment.

3. I would presume that the mere entry of the village in the Kayemgutta acct of 1835 from the

Col:

Doddallapur Sammat, Doddalla

14

Residence, name age &c. of the present Owner	Relation to original grantee	If in connection with the original Kaul, how obtained & how held at present
10.	11	12.
1. Dodda Venkatasawmy. Sub Overseer in Channel Dept., Periapatan range.	Alienee.	By purchase
2. Chikk Venkatasawmy of Doddaballapur. —		
3. Shuni Venkatasawmi, Manegar of Tippur Chan -nel of Yedatore Tal. —		
4. Gowndappah. —		

Nandidrug Division

15

Review and confirmation by the Superintendent of Inam Settls.

Collr: Commr's Office is not to be accepted for the validity of the tenure, and, unless the Inam Rule of 50 years enjoyment, conveying a valid title be also applied to the Rayencutta villages, this village is liable to resumption, unless it be treated as a Jodi village. It may be said that the Sircharajah never gave Sannads for ordinary Kandayem lands or villages, and every Considera-tion is due to the fact that such lands were granted on a Sraya or progressive Assessment and that they have been reclaimed from jungle and waste & been populated with villages; but the absence of the word Kayem, which is so distinctly used in all regular Kayencutta Sannads & Firmans, would tend to show that the Rajah had not intended to Convey away the right of revising the Assessment, & the non-entry in any Jari Inam Sect. would show that the tenure was not intended to be Inam.

4. The extract from this Regr will be Submitted through the Inam Commr for the orders

of

16

No 7925 Date 21st Dec 178
181

Revd Survey Comns No 1067
d/ 25th September 1878.
2. Also Inam Supts No 41
d/ 19th September 1878

L. K.
17-10-
2

Order thereon

The Inam Superintendent solicits instructions as to whether the village of Tamsettihalli in the Doddballapur Taluk should be treated as Mayamgutta or Jodi - This village is alleged to have been granted under the Mahārājas Order quoted in the Hoogdals Nirup of 1820 and the Amildars Tahkid of 1827/28 The original order itself is not forthcoming - The Nirup quotes that as granting the village in Jodi, and the Tahkid quotes the order also as making it a Mayam-gutta grant - The Inam Commissioner is of opinion that if such villages as the one in question claim to be treated as an Inam village having their claim on the

Nirup

of the Ch: Commr. —

5. Nr. 2 in Col: 10 also states that the deed of purchase of the other half of the village is in mortgage with Chik Gerrappa Naidu, to whom since notice to produce it on the 26th Instant

4th Sept. 1874.

(Signed) Robt. Cole.

6. Nr. 2 now produces document Nr. 4 in col: 7, which is a Yaki'd from the Amil to the Seistdar, Chandragiri & Potail, in which the Maharajah's order of 1827-29 is quoted as having granted the village on Hayagutta. Mr. Bowring the former Ch: Commr. has ruled that no authority lower than that of a Foujdar is to be received; but the Yaki'd of the Amil might tend to show the meaning or intention at the time, though of course he might have misconstrued or exaggerated that meaning or intention. —

(Signed) Robt. Cole

4th Sept. 1874

"True Copy".

Supt. of Inam Settlt.

Nerup of Diwan Venkat Raj Urs, and on that of the Hougdai, in which the term "Hayam" is not used, and if the 50 years Rule be applied, the Inam Rules might be equally claimed to be applied to purely Govt lands which would shew that the Assessment had been un-changed for 50 years.

2- The Chief Commr observes that the term Jodi refers to an Inam tenure which is quite distinct in kind from Hayamgutta. The Nerup of Diwan Venkat Raj Urs, unsupported by the production of the Sannad of H. H. the Maha Raja therein referred to, and a Variance with the Returns of the Entry in the public accounts is utterly valueless. The little entitled to on the Entry in the public Accounts of 1835 as Hayamgutta, and the actual Enjoyment of the village as such ever since this Enjoyment cannot under the circumstances be regarded as

consideration for the Nerup of Diwan Venkat Raj Urs unsupported as it is by the production of the Sannad or Title deed therein mentioned, must deem valueless, as conferring the grant of the Village Hayamgutta. The little of the Village as Hayamgutta rests solely on the Entry of the Village as a Hayamgutta in the public accounts and the mere Enjoyment of it for a less period than 50 years. The Village title accordingly I treated as a Jodi

Inam Villages, falling under the Provisions of Clause I para VI of the Land Inam Rules

18

as suspicious, but as one not supported by sufficient Authority, and must be treated as an Inam tenure under similar circumstances would be - The enjoyment under the Hayamgutta tenure, must be reckoned as dating from 1835, previous papers not supporting this, and it is therefore not of 50 years duration -

The village must be treated on the principle that would be applied to a Jodi Inam of less than 50 years enjoyment not supported by a valid grant -

Secretary

To
The Survey and Settlement Commissioner
" Supt. Inam Settlements.

Forwarded the papers noted in the cover to the Revenue Commissioner S. D. for Inam Settlement, with reference to Govt. Clause I para VI of Land Revenue Code

1878 48.

To
The Surveyor, Settlement Commissioner
at Mysore.

Dated 21st December

No. 7925
Dated 187

Direct to what Shanbhogs
in the Village Sodambattipura
should be made as Sodi
from Village

Rec'd

97

05619.

1879. 137

From Survey & Settlt Commr.

102

To Secy: to Ch: Comr of Mysore.

L. K. 17-3

Dated 7 Feby: 1879.

Despatched

Received 28-2-79

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 207 } 1879.
No.

Regarding Tamsettihalli Village of the Dod Ballapur yt.

G. Griffin

28-2-79

Please send me Not. d 25 Aug 1877 if it is under that that the Kaveripatna village enquiry is held — or any other not. or rule under which the enquiry is being conducted. Please see the papers herewith on the above Subject

14/3. ML

21

No. 207 of 1879

Survey Commissioner's Office.

Poona 24th February 1879

Memorandum

In this case it appears that the order of the Maharajah granting this village as Kayamgootta is not forthcoming but it is quoted in a Foujdars nirup of 1828 which quotes the order as granting the village on Joodee. The nirup of the Foujdar is by Para 2 of Chief Commissioners order No. 7925/181 of 21st December last declared to be valueless to confer the village as Kayumgootta, but notwithstanding it appears to

to be considered sufficient to justify the grant of the village as Joodee a Superior tenure to Kayumgootta, in that it makes a permanent Settlement of the Revenue a point specially interdicted in relation to villages declared to be Kayumgootta by order of Government of India No. 52-R of 24th May 1877 printed with Chief Commissioner's No. 3052/77 dated 26th June 1877.

2 This case may prove a precedent it is therefore referred to the Chief Commissioner for orders, as the Superiority of the Joodee tenure granted to the Kayumgootta tenure denied may have escaped notice

23

notice. This point was again referred

to in Enam Commissioner's No. 79 of the

27.1.79 23rd ultimo.

Returned to record
10/3/79

3 It is requested that the

appended papers may be returned.—

Survey & Enam Commissioner

of Mysore.

28

24
28.

No 71 of 1879

Enam Commissioners Office
Poona 18th January 1879.

In Enam Supt requests Report
the Enam Com: who has spoken
on this case, if does not appear
why a village which has failed
upon the Rayeegutta tenure
should be conceded a Joodee
Enam tenure -

C Manson
Pz

Shown in the Reg. & Journals.

V.B
24.1.79

No 63

Enam Supt's Office
Bangalore. 28 Jan.y 1879

Has the honor to state that, when the
Rayeegutta tenure is not made out,
the Village ought to be resumed; but
in this case the Tahsildar's Niroop states
that the Village had been granted
by the late Amildar-Rajah as Jodi.

D. Mc
Supt.

25 1878.

From

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

To The Survey & Settt. Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore 21st December

Despatched —

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 7925

R No. 181

Directing that Yamtelli shalli Village in the Doddaballapur Talluk be treated as Sooji Inam Village.

Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore

Read Survey Commissioner's No. 1064 dated 25th September 1878.

2. Also Inam Superintendent's No. 41 dated 19th September 1878.

Order thereon — No. 7925/181 dated 21st December 1878

The Inam Superintendent solicits instructions as to whether the village of Jamsettihalli in the Doddaballapur Taluk should be treated as Kayamgutta or Jodi. The village is alleged to have been granted under the Maharaja's order quoted in the Jouzdari Hirup of 1828 and the Amildari Sakid of 1827-28. The original order itself is not forthcoming. The Hirup quotes that order as granting the village on Jodi, and the Sakid quotes the order also as making a Kayamgutta grant. The Inam Commissioner is of opinion that if such villages as the one in question claim to be treated as our Inam villages basing their claim on the Hirup of Diwan Venkat Rayaru, and on that of the Jouzdar, in which the term "Kayam" is not used, and if the 50 years rule be applied, the Inam rules might be equally

Claimed

claimed to be applied to purely Government lands which would shew that the assessment had been unchanged for 50 years.

2. The Chief Commissioner considers that the Inam of the Tongdar Venkatrayiers unsupported as it is by the production of the Sanad or order of His Highness the Maha Rajah therein referred to, must be deemed valueless, as conferring the grant of the village as Kayamgutta. The title of the holder dates virtually from the entry of the village as a Kayamgutta in the public accounts and in this view the enjoyment is of a less period than 50 years. The village will accordingly be treated as a Jodi Inam village, falling under the terms of Clause E, para VI of the Land Inam Rules.

Secretary

To
The Survey & Settlement
& Inam Commissioner.
in Mysore.

Rept. Inam Settlements.